



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,461	07/24/2003	Wendy Eason	60027.0351US01/BS02512	1318
36072	7590	10/21/2010		
AT&T Legal Department - MB			EXAMINER	
Attn: Patent Docketing			BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J	
Room 2A-207				
One AT&T Way			ART UNIT	
Bedminster, NJ 07921			PAPER NUMBER	
			2439	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			10/21/2010	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/626,461

Applicant(s)

EASON, WENDY

Examiner

CHRISTOPHER J. BROWN

Art Unit

2439

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-15 and 17-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-15 and 17-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine Meffert US 2003/0037261 with Nagai EP 1016972. Applicant argues that there is no motivation because "Nagai's image conversion is provided to increase access to content....provides no mechanism for securing".

Examiner argues that Nagai does increase access across platforms by using an image instead of text, so that computers using different operating systems may interpret the image equally, however, distribution of content has no bearing on the security of content. Meffert's "control of dissemination" are merely further security features, such other

Applicant argues no one would combine Meffert with Nagai because of the additional complexity without benefit.

However, the Examiner asserts that the write protection of Nagai would be further enhanced by the encryption of Meffert. Images may still be altered, even if the purpose of the instant invention is to prevent alteration. Nagai enhances the messages of Meffert by making them universal to understand across different platforms. Both references are of analogous arts, because each is about email and or sending messages to others.

The combination of the two references would have reasonable success, as text converted to image of Nagai would be further encrypted by Meffert.

Final rejection below is similar to the previous Non-final rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, 6-15, 17, 18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meffert US 2003/0037261 in view of Nagai EP 1016972 A1

As per claims 1, and 11 Meffert teaches message composition logic to composer a message to at least one recipient (email text composer) [0083]. Meffert teaches logic protection to protect the message against subsequent alteration by the at least one recipient upon receiving a user indication to enable the write protect logic (specialized button to encrypt and sign to create a package) [0083]. Meffert teaches conversion of a format of a text a body of the message to a format protected against alterations (encrypted package remains encrypted on recipients machine, signed to prevent alteration, DRM digital shredding, blocked from editing) [0083], [0093]-[0095].

Meffert fails to teach converting the text into a picture format.

Nagai teaches composing and email message and converting the message from text to an image [0034]. Nagai teaches the conversion takes place at the client prior to being sent to

a recipient [0034]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the graphical conversion of Nagai with the security of Meffert because it allows viewing without specific fonts and provides write protection.

As per claim 4, Meffert teaches the email is stored on a central server [0077].

As per claims 6, and 14, Nagai teaches the image is a JPEG image [0034].

As per claims 7, and 13, Nagai teaches the image is a GIF image [0034].

As per claims 8, and 12, Nagai teaches conversion of the body text of a message to an image [0034]. The examiner takes official notice that a PDF file is a well known image file.

As per claim 9, Meffert teaches the logic allows the user to compose a new message [0083].

As per claim 10, Meffert teaches the logic allows a plurality of options including enabling write protect (specialized button) [0083].

As per claim 15, Meffert teaches the logic enables the user to choose whether to protect the message or not (specialized button) [0083].

As per claim 17, Meffert teaches the message is stored on a central server [0077].

As per claim 18, Meffert teaches the message can be downloaded for viewing [0098].

Claims 3, 5, 19, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meffert US 2003/0037261 in view of Nagai EP 1016972 A1 in view of Ogilvie US 6,711,608

As per claims 3, 19, Ogilvie teaches that an email may have images included as an inline image (Col 6 lines 20-26).

As per claims 5, and 20, Ogilvie teaches that an email may have images attached to the main body (Col 6 lines 20-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the attachment options of Ogilvie with the previous email system to expand options for the user.

Claims 21, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meffert US 2003/0037261 in view of Nagai EP 1016972 A1 in view of Czyszczewski US 6,577,907

As per claims 21, and 22, Meffert teaches a selection button so that the user may choose to send a plain text email, or a protected email [0083]. Thus a first email may be protected, and a second email may be regular text.

Nagai teaches conversion of the text of a message to an image [0034].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the graphical conversion of Nagai with the security of Meffert because it allows viewing without specific fonts and provides write protection.

Czyszczewski teaches an explicit text to image conversion button and regular text button to send an email. (Fig 9D, Col 13 lines 5-10)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the graphical send button for graphical protection and without graphical protection so that a user could explicitly choose which format to send email in.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER J. BROWN whose telephone number is (571)272-3833. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edan Orgad can be reached on (571)272-7884. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christopher J. Brown/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2439

10/18/10